



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,189	04/19/2001	Mark E. Zappi	2343-114-27	1194

7590 03/22/2005

Supervisor  
Patent Prosecution Services  
PIPER MARBURY RUDNICK & WOLFE LLP  
1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036-2412

EXAMINER	
CINTINS, IVARS C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1724	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/837,189

Applicant(s)

ZAPPI ET AL.

Examiner

Ivars C. Cintins

Art Unit

1724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 15 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

re

Art Unit: 1724

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 11, 13 and 14 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haase et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,178,438; hereinafter "Haase") in view of Wieser-Linhart (U.S. Patent No. 5,762,662). As pointed out in the previous Office action, Haase discloses removing soluble organic contaminants of the type recited (see col. 13, line 23 through col. 14, line 49) from a fluid such as water (see col. 1, line 12) with a cellulose based (col. 13, lines 1-7) adsorbent (col. 2, line 32) packed in a column (see col. 2, line 44). This reference further teaches that up to 100% of the dissolved impurities can be removed from the contaminated fluid (see col. 14, lines 50-52). Accordingly, this primary reference discloses the claimed invention with the exception of the recited composting treatment. Wieser-Linhart discloses a similar process for adsorbing organic contaminants from a liquid (see col. 1, line 47) with a cellulose based material (see col. 1, line 53; and col. 2, line 6), and further teaches (see col. 2, lines 15-17) disposing of the residual material by composting. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compost the spent adsorbent material of Haase, as suggested by Wieser-Linhart, in order to dispose of this spent adsorbent material. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to reduce over 50% of spent material in the modified primary reference, as recited in claim 11, in order to optimize disposal of this spent material.

Furthermore, since Applicant has not shown that additional materials (e.g. the cationic modifier

Art Unit: 1724

employed by Haase) would materially change the characteristics of Applicant's invention, the "consisting essentially of" language now recited in line 4 of claim 1 has been construed as equivalent to "comprising."

Claim 3 is again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haase in view of Wieser-Linhart as applied above, and further in view of Sato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,206,080; hereinafter "Sato"). As pointed out in the previous Office action, the modified primary reference discloses the claimed invention with the exception of the flow direction through the column. Sato teaches that contaminated water may be passed through a column of adsorbent material in either an upward or a downward direction (see col. 4, line 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to pass the water undergoing treatment in the modified primary reference through the column of cellulose based adsorbent material disclosed therein (see col. 2, line 44) in an upward direction, as disclosed by Sato, since this "up-flow hydraulics" is capable of promoting contact between this adsorbent material and the fluid undergoing treatment.

Claims 5 and 12 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haase in view of Wieser-Linhart as applied above, and further in view of Hondroulis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,027,652; hereinafter "Hondroulis"). As pointed out in the previous Office action, the modified primary reference discloses the claimed invention with the exception of the use of kenaf as the cellulosic material. Hondroulis teaches (see col. 1, lines 56-60) that a wide variety of cellulosic materials, including wood and kenaf, have been used as sorbents for hazardous materials. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the kenaf of Hondroulis as the cellulosic starting material of

Art Unit: 1724

Haase (see col. 13, lines 1-7), since Hondroulis teaches that this kenaf has the same adsorbent properties as the other cellulosic materials disclosed in the modified primary reference.

Claims 1, 6-9, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zenno et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,102,783; hereinafter "Zenno") in view of Wieser-Linhart. Zenno discloses removing organic contaminants which are at least slightly soluble (see col. 8, lines 52-57) from water with a natural cellulose based adsorbent (col. 2, lines 2-12) packed in a column (see col. 2, line 42). Accordingly, this primary reference discloses the claimed invention with the exception of the recited composting treatment. Wieser-Linhart discloses a similar process for adsorbing organic contaminants from a liquid with a cellulose based material, and further teaches disposing of the residual material by composting. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compost the spent adsorbent material of Zenno, as suggested by Wieser-Linhart, in order to dispose of this spent adsorbent material. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to reduce over 50% of spent material in the modified primary reference, as recited in claim 11, in order to optimize disposal of this spent material.

Claim 3 is again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zenno in view of Wieser-Linhart as applied above, and further in view of Sato et al. The modified primary reference discloses the claimed invention with the exception of the flow direction through the column. Sato teaches that contaminated water may be passed through a column of adsorbent material in either an upward or a downward direction; and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to pass the water undergoing treatment in the modified primary reference through the column of cellulose based adsorbent

Art Unit: 1724

material disclosed therein in an upward direction, as disclosed by Sato, since this “up-flow hydraulics” is capable of promoting contact between this adsorbent material and the fluid undergoing treatment.

Claim 10 remains withdrawn from further consideration, as being directed to a non-elected species.

Claim 15 is allowed because the references of record do not teach or fairly suggest removing a contaminant comprising TNT from a fluid by passing the fluid through a column packed with kenaf, and then composting the spent kenaf.

Fahlvik (U.S. Patent No. 3,617,565) discloses a similar process for removing contaminants from a substrate with a natural cellulosic material. Leedy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,062,954) teaches that cellulose fibers have an affinity for soluble oils (see col. 1, lines 16-17).

Applicant’s arguments filed January 28, 2005 have been noted and carefully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive of patentability. Applicant contends that the additional materials contained in the Haase et al. reference are excluded by the “consisting essentially of” language now present in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant has the burden of showing that the introduction of additional components would materially change the characteristics of Applicant’s invention (*In re De Lajarte*, 337 F.2d 870, 143 USPQ 256(CCPA 1964)). Absent such a showing, “consisting essentially of” will be construed as equivalent to “comprising” (*PPG*, 156 F.3d at 1355, 48 USPQ2d at 1355). See M.P.E.P. § 2111.03.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to I. Cintins whose telephone number is (571) 272-1155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If

Art Unit: 1724

attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Duane Smith, can be reached at (571) 272-1166.

The centralized facsimile number for the USPTO is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Ivars C. Cintins  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1724

I. Cintins  
March 17, 2005